IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.1636 OF 2005

Kuldeep Kumar Sethee. .. Petitioner
v/s.
Oil & Natural Gas Corporation
Ltd. & ors. .. Respondents

Petitioner in person.
Ms.Snehal Paranjape i/by Little & Co. for res.No.1.

CORAM : H.L. GOKHALE &
ABHAY S. OKA, JJ.

DATED : 17th January 2006

P.C. :

1. Heard the petitioner who is appearing in person. Ms.Paranjape appears for respondent No.1.

2. The petitioner is a Superintending Engineer working under the 1st respondent. He is making a grievance that he is not being promoted to the post of Chief Engineer and he is seeking a direction to that effect that he should be promoted with effect from 1st January 1998. As far as this aspect is concerned, it is a matter to be gone into by the 1st respondent and its officers and the case of the petitioner has to be considered as per the governing rules and on the basis of his service record and merit. We do not propose to give any directions in that behalf as

of now.

3. What has however happened is that the petitioner is presently proceeded with in a departmental enquiry. The respondents have an internet portal and it is their allegation that the charge-sheet has been served on the petitioner that he has published some information on that portal which brings down the reputation of some of the officers of the 1st respondent. He has been charge-sheeted and that enquiry is going on. In the meanwhile after he was charge-sheeted he has placed on the internet portal some information regarding this enquiry also. This has invited the second charge-sheet. The petitioner submits that as far as the charges leading to the first charge-sheet are concerned, they are not aspects on which he should have been charge-sheeted. It is his submission that he has brought to the notice of the 1st respondent the relevant information on the basis of which they should take cognizance for the improvement of the 1st respondent-Organisation. The stand of the 1st respondent on the other hand is that the petitioner was not expected to place any such information on such internet portal and that the same was false. In any case, that enquiry is

proceeding and we do not propose to interfere therein.

4. Ms.Paranjape appearing for the 1st respondent states that the petitioner has not been co-operating with the enquiry. The petitioner denies this allegation. We expect him to co-operate with the enquiry so as to enable the officer to complete it at the earliest. We however add a rider that in the event the order passed at the end of the enquiry is adverse to the petitioner, it will not be acted upon for a period of four weeks after the same is served on the petitioner.

5. Petition stands disposed of with the above order.

(H.L. GOKHALE, J.)

(ABHAY S. OKA, J.)